

REMARKS

Responsive to the Office Action mailed December 10, 2008, Applicants provide the following.

Claims 1, 11, 17 and 19 are amended. Claims 5, 12-13, 18 and 20 have been cancelled. Therefore, eighteen (18) claims remain pending in the application: Claims 1-4, 6-11, 14-17, 19 and 21-23. Reconsideration of claims 1-4, 6-11, 14-17, 19 and 21-23 in view of the amendments and remarks below is respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's willingness to take part in the telephonic interview on September 22, 2009.

By way of this amendment, Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain any outstanding issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned at (858) 552-1311 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

1. Claims 1-11 and 14-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,141,003 (Chor et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,336,053 (Beatty). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that claims -4, 6-11, 14-17, 19 and 21-23 are patentable over the applied combination because the applied combination of Chor and Beatty fails to teach all of the limitations as recited in at least amended independent claims 1 and 11, and further, one skilled in the art would not combine Beatty with Chor.

As indicated above in the Summary of Applicant Initiated Examiner Interview, Examiner Shang agreed that the applied combination of Chor and Beatty did

not teach all of the limitation of claim 5. The limitations of claim 5 have been amended into claims 1 and 11.

Therefore, claims 1 and 11 and the claims that depend from claims 1 and 11 are patentable over the applied combination of Chor and Beatty.

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended in order to pursue the timely issuance of the allowable subject matter. Although these claims are amended herein, Applicants are not conceding in this application that these claims are not patentable over the cited references. Applicants reserve the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Specifically, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the subject matter of amended claims 1 and 11, as well as other subject matter within the application, in one or more continuing applications. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that the Applicants have made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Claims 2-4, 6-10, 14-17, 19 and 21-23 depend from one of claims 1 and 11. Therefore, claims 2-4, 6-10, 14-17, 19 and 21-23 are also allowable due at least to their dependency on claims 1 and 11, and the arguments presented above with respect to claims 1 and 11.

Applicants further respectfully submit that one skilled in the art would not consider Beatty in view of Chor, and further, one skilled in the art would not combine Chor with Beatty. Specifically, Chor is directed to a channel bar for use in an entertainment system that provides television channel information. Beatty is completely unrelated to entertainment systems or providing information about television content.

Instead, Beatty is used in controlling operations in a factory. One skilled in the art of electronic programming guides or entertainment systems would not reference or consider Beatty. Beatty is completely unassociated with the channel bar described in Chor and has no relation to entertainment systems or providing television channel information. Therefore, Beatty is non-analogous art and one skilled in the art would not consider Beatty in relation to Chor.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art would not alter the Chor patent to replace the add icon with a remove icon and Chor fails to suggest replacing an add icon with a remove icon. Instead, Chor already describes alternative methods for removing entries in the list, and thus, it would not be obvious to alter Chor to replace the add icon with the remove icon.

Therefore, at least amended claims 1 and 11 are patentable over the applied combination of Chor and Beatty.

Regarding at least claim 19, Applicants respectfully submit that Chor fails to teach or describe at least the secondary menu further comprising a text portion including a description of the show corresponding to the channel in the list of channels stored in memory as recited by claim 19. The channel bars displaying the stored channels described by Chor are a set of linearly arranged selectable icons associated with a particular stored channel (Chor, col. 2, lines 39-41 and 48-50). The channel bars described in Chor do not comprise a text portion providing a program description for the show corresponding to a channel stored in memory. At best, Chor describes a banner for displaying program information (Chor col. 5, lines 40-55) as part of the full channel bar user interface. This banner displays the program information for the “presently selected channel” (Chor, col. 2, lines 22-32) that the user has selected for viewing. However, Chor does not describe using the banner to display a description of a show corresponding to a channel stored in memory while scrolling through the list of channels

in memory as recited in claim 19. Therefore, Chor does not describe at least each element of claim 19.

Claim 21 is also patentable over the cited combination of Chor and Beatty. Neither Chor nor Beatty teach or suggest at least a second screen menu that, when displayed, is superimposed over the playback of the programming data associated with the channel currently being displayed.

At least claim 15 is also patentable over Chor, Beatty and/or their combination. Applicants respectfully submit that, Chor, Beatty and their combination do not teach or suggest at least an integrated receiver decoder that comprises an amplification circuitry; a demodulator; a main logic block; a transceiver device; a remote command unit interface; an extension bus that couple with and provides a communication path between at least the main logic block and each of the transceiver device and the remote command unit interface; and a memory; wherein the remote command unit interface receive at least a first command from a remote control device and transfers a first interrupt request signal, corresponding to the first command, to the central processing unit such that the central processing unit, in response to receiving the first interrupt, executes interrupt software contained in one of the memory and the second memory to implement storing, into the memory, the programming data associated with the channel currently being displayed to add the current channel to the list of channels stored in said memory.

Therefore, at least claim 15 is patentable over Chor and Beatty.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that the above amendments and remarks place the pending claims in a condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 1, 2009

/Steven M. Freeland/

Steven M. Freeland
Reg. No. 42,555
Attorney for Applicants
(858) 552-1311

Address all correspondence to:
FITCH, EVEN, TABIN & FLANNERY
Thomas F. Lebens
120 So. LaSalle Street, Ste. 1600
Chicago, IL 60603
(858) 552-1311